



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/859,426	05/18/2001	Chi-Thanh Dang	109445	3709

25944 7590 05/31/2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

BASHORE, WILLIAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/859,426

Applicant(s)

DANG ET AL.

Examiner

William L. Bashore

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION


1. This action is responsive to communications, Appeal brief filed 3/17/2006, to the original application filed 5/18/2001.
2. Claims 1-22 pending. Claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 22 are independent.
3. It is hereby noted that Examiner Peter Smith is no longer the examiner of record for the instant application. The new examiner of record for said instant application is William L. Bashore. Please update future correspondence accordingly.
3. In view of the Appeal brief filed on 3/17/2006, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New ground(s) of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields et al. (hereinafter Fields), U.S. Patent No. 6,128,655 filed July 10, 1998.**

In regard to independent claim 1, Fields teaches a system of filtering, formatting, and reuse of Web based content comprising the formatting of Web page content from a Website, and recasting said Web page content (merging) into the context of the host site so as to preserve the “look and feel” of said host site, using templates associated with client sites (Fields Abstract, column 2 lines 47-51, column 4 lines 25-36, column 10 lines 23-37; compare with claim 1 “*A system for managing identity information in a merged content portion, comprising:*”).

Fields teaches document templates and filters for customized reformatting of a Web site’s content (Fields column 4 lines 25-35, 57-60), said templates and filters can be reasonable interpreted as “style sheets”, and are generally associated (identified with) a plurality of clients. Fields further teaches registration of client accounts accordingly (Fields column 7 lines 5-45, column 10 lines 23-37). Fields also teaches that secondary page components, such as “cascading style sheets” can be accommodated by the invention of Fields (Fields column 4 lines 45-46). (compare with claim 1 “*an identity storage that stores identity information including content elements and style sheet information, associated with a plurality of referring clients and... ’*”).

Although Fields does not explicitly recite associating the above with "...a user", nevertheless, since Fields can fix relative embedded URLs to point back to the hosting site for processing (Fields column 8 lines 28-40), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret said templates and filters associated with a client site, as also associated with a user who clicks said URLs, providing the benefit of presenting content for a specific user accordingly. Please also note Fields column 9 lines 9-13, which a user can (in an alternative embodiment) change the look and feel accordingly.

Fields teaches a user requesting a URL (from a user) on a host site, said URL leading to fetched content (i.e. objects) from a client site to be reformatted accordingly (Fields column 8 lines 28-40; compare with claim 1 "*a client and user determining circuit that determines a first object representing a sending client and a user of a received request for information from an information provider;*").

Fields teaches registering Web page content accordingly, using templates and filters customized to format said content in the context of the hosting site. A content record (i.e. filter definition, ad revenue, etc.) for an account is maintained in a filter database (Fields column 3 lines 10-15, column 4 lines 25-35, 52-67, column 5 lines 1-10, column 7 lines 5-67, especially lines 24-28, and 58-61; compare with claim 1 "*a skeleton/virtual content determining circuit that determines which of the stored identity information and the style sheet information correspond to the client and the user to create a skeleton/virtual content record based on determined stored identity information and style sheet information;*").

Fields teaches a host site which brokers a client browser's request for a Web page. The host requests said Web page accordingly (Fields column 3 lines 1-14, column 4 lines 36-45; compare with claim 1 "*an input/output circuit that requests and receives the information from the information provider; and*").

Fields teaches merging content, and displaying the result accordingly. It is noted that the reformatted Web page reflects different content object, placement, etc., therefore is different then the original page (Fields column 4 lines 52-63, also Figures 3-4; compare with claim 1 "*a merging circuit that determines the merged content portion based on the information received from the information provider and the created skeleton/virtual content record and merges the merged content portion into the created skeleton/virtual content*").

record to create a second object different from the first object, the created second object is outputted to the sending client and the user to maintain a look and feel of a client website.”).

In regard to dependent claim 2, Fields teaches document filters and templates customized to a client Website, facilitating recasting content accordingly (Fields column 4 lines 25-30, 53-67, column 7 lines 55-67).

In regard to dependent claim 3, Although Fields does not explicitly recite associating the above with “...a user identification”, nevertheless, since Fields can fix relative embedded URLs to point back to the hosting site for processing (Fields column 8 lines 28-40), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret a user’s choosing of a URL as an address associated with a user who clicks said URLs, providing the benefit of presenting content for a specific user activated URL accordingly.

In regard to dependent claim 4, Fields teaches display of merged content as an electronic Web page (typically stored in a browser cache pursuant to display) (Fields Figure 4).

In regard to dependent claim 5, Fields teaches display of merged content as an electronic Web page (typically stored in a browser cache pursuant to display), said Web page containing hyperlinks and clickable banners (i.e. interactive) (Fields Figure 4).

In regard to independent claim 6, claim 6 reflects the computer implemented methods comprising computer readable instructions used to implement the system as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 7-10, claims 7-10 reflect the computer implemented methods comprising computer readable instructions used to implement the system as claimed in claims 2, 3, 5, 4 respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 11, claim 11 reflects the computer readable storage medium comprising computer readable instructions used to implement the system as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 12-15, claims 12-15 reflect the computer readable storage medium comprising computer readable instructions used to implement the system as claimed in claims 2, 3, 5, 4 respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 16, claim 16 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 17-20, claims 17-20 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 2-4 respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 21, claim 21 reflects the computer program product comprising computer readable instructions used to implement the system as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 22, claim 22 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William L. Bashore whose telephone number is (571) 272-4088. The examiner can normally be reached on 11:30am - 8:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

May 27, 2006